

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

GARY L. MILANO,
Plaintiff,

v.

DANIELLE DOUGLAS, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. [19-cv-03121-RS](#)

ORDER DISMISSING ACTION

Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 7-1(b), the pending motions to dismiss are suitable for disposition without oral argument, and the hearing set for August 8, 2019 is vacated. Plaintiff Gary L. Milano, appearing *in pro se*, has filed a complaint listing in the caption as defendants, Danielle Douglas, Lisa Janine Mendez, and the “State of California, Inc.”¹ The 24 page complaint states no cognizable claim against any defendant. While the allegations are difficult to summarize; a few excerpts may demonstrate the basic tone:

The U.S. is a Crown Colony. The U.S. has always been and remains a Crown (Roman) colony.

Whereas the Triple Crown of Ba’al aka the Papal Tiara and Triregnum In 1302 Pope Boniface issued his famous Papal Bull Unam Sanctum—the first Express Trust

The Bar Associations worldwide have been responsible ever since in

¹ Although the State of California (with or without an “Inc.”) has not appeared in this action, given the nature of the allegations, this order of dismissal will dispose of the entire case.

administering the “reaping” of the souls of the lost and damned

Thereby, the Plaintiff/Petitioner is NOT bound by secular de-facto alleged rules/statutes/de-facto color of law, herein, noticed to all human legal fictions corporate creation of the inferior secular state by fraud of adhesion equity contract

The motions to dismiss suggest this action arose from a state law proceeding for dissolution of marriage, that defendant Douglas was the judge presiding in that action, and that defendant Mendes represented plaintiff’s former spouse. The few allegations against Judge Douglas are frivolous assertions challenging her entitlement to hold office. To the extent that Milano’s claims must be construed broadly, nothing in the facts alleged support any inference of a potential claim against Judge Douglas that would fall outside judicial immunity, or the immunity from suit in this forum provided by the Eleventh Amendment.

Defendant Mendez is named in the caption, however, the complaint includes no allegations against her. On the record here, there is no reasonable basis to conclude plaintiff holds a viable claim against Mendez, or that any such claim would be subject to federal jurisdiction. Accordingly, the complaint is dismissed without leave to amend.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 29, 2019



RICHARD SEEBORG
United States District Judge